

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

BILLY WAYNE LIGON, #247882,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO. 2:18-CV-31-WHA
	)	
MELINDA HUMPHREY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Billy Wayne Ligon, a state inmate, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action challenging his classification as a restricted offender. Ligon did not submit the \$350 filing fee or \$50 administrative fee and, instead, filed a document seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* before this court. In support of this request, Ligon provided financial information necessary to determine the average monthly balance in his inmate account for the 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of this complaint and the average monthly deposits to his inmate account during the past six months.

After a thorough review of the financial information provided by Ligon and pursuant to the requisite provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A), the court determined that Ligon owed an initial partial filing fee of \$25.10. *Doc. No. 3* at 1-2. The court therefore ordered Ligon to pay the initial partial filing fee on or before February 7, 2018. *Id.* at 2. In addition, this order specifically informed Ligon “**that it is his responsibility to submit the appropriate paperwork to the prison account clerk for transmission of such funds to this court for payment of the initial partial filing fee.**” *Id.* (emphasis in

original). The order also “advised [Ligon] that if he is unable to procure the initial partial filing fee within the time allowed by this court he must inform the court of such inability and request an extension of time within which to file the fee.” *Id.* at 3. Moreover, the court specifically cautioned Ligon that failure to pay the requisite fee within the time allowed by the court would result in a Recommendation “that this case be dismissed and such dismissal will not be reconsidered unless exceptional circumstances exist.” *Id.*

Ligon has failed to pay the initial partial filing fee within the time allowed by the court. The undersigned therefore concludes that this case is due to be dismissed without prejudice. *See Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir.1989) (holding that, as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion). The authority of courts to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and is acknowledged by Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962). This authority empowers courts “to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Id.* at 630–31; *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that the sanctions imposed can include dismissal of the action without prejudice).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be dismissed without prejudice for failure of the plaintiff to pay the initial partial filing fee in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A) as ordered by this court.

On or before **March 1, 2018**, the plaintiff may file objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which he objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The plaintiff is advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall "waive the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11TH Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2018.

/s/Charles S. Coody  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE